

Application Number 10/615,336  
Amendment dated 13 May 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 16 February 2005

Remarks

No claims have been added or cancelled in this Amendment. Therefore, Claims 10–15, 18, and 21–24 remain pending in this application. Claims 10 and 21–24 are independent. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 18 and 24 are allowed.

Interview Summary.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview in this application on 5 May 2005. The following summarizes the substance of the interview, in accordance with the guidelines provided by MPEP 713.04.

- (A) No exhibits were shown, and no demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Independent Claims 10 and 21–23 were discussed.
- (C) The teachings of U.S. Patent 6,125,291 ("Miesel") and U.S. Patent 6,671,531 ("Al-Ali") were discussed.
- (D) The principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature are presented herein in the "Amendments to the Claims".
- (E) Applicants discussed and agreed upon amended claim language to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references.
- (F) No other pertinent matters were discussed.
- (G) Applicants and Examiner agreed that the teachings of the Miesel and Al-Ali references are not applicable to the currently pending claims as amended herein.

Claim Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 10, 11, 14, 15 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Al-Ali. Claims 10–15 and 21–23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miesel. Claims 10 and 21–23 are independent.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 10 and 21–23 to include non-functional claim language that distinguishes the claimed invention from the cited

Application Number 10/615,336  
Amendment dated 13 May 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 16 February 2005

references. These amendments were agreed upon during the telephone interview conducted on 5 May 2005. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of independent Claims 10 and 21–23 be withdrawn.

Claims 11–15 depend from independent Claim 10, and further define the invention of Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 11–15 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons that Claim 10 is allowable, in addition to reciting further unique distinguishing features. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Conclusion.**

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, any remarks in support of patentability of one claim should not be imputed to any other claim, even if similar terminology is used. Applicants respectfully traverse each of the Examiner's rejections and each of the Examiner's assertions regarding what the prior art shows or teaches, even if not expressly discussed herein. Although changes to the claims have been made, no acquiescence or estoppel is or should be implied thereby; such amendments are made only to expedite prosecution of the present application and are without prejudice to the presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims relating to the same or similar subject matter. If some issue remains that the Examiner feels can be addressed by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP

Dated: 13 may 05

By: Kyle F. Schlueter  
Kyle F. Schlueter, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 54,912  
Customer No. 20,995  
(310) 551-3450

1696251  
050505

Page 6 of 6